

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ANTHONY CROSS,	)	3:13-cv-00433-MMD-WGC
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	<b><u>MINUTES OF THE COURT</u></b>
vs.	)	
	)	November 20, 2014
RON JAEGER, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants	)	
	)	

PRESENT: THE HONORABLE WILLIAM G. COBB, U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DEPUTY CLERK: KATIE LYNN OGDEN REPORTER: NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF(S): NONE APPEARING

COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT(S): NONE APPEARING

**MINUTE ORDER IN CHAMBERS:**

Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion Requesting Authentication of Plaintiffs' (sic) Exhibit-E, Page No. 16 Submitted in Support of Plaintiffs' (sic) Civil Rights Complaint. (Doc. # 30.) Defendants have responded (Doc. # 34) and Plaintiff has replied (Doc. # 38).

Defendants state they cannot understand the nature of the relief plaintiff is seeking or "how this court can authenticate the document." (Doc. # 34 at 2.) Although Plaintiff states his motion "seems very clear" (Doc. # 38 at 2), the court shares the same difficulty in interpreting the relief Plaintiff is seeking.

To the extent Plaintiff's motion seeks to have the court "authenticate" one of his exhibits, the court declines to do so. It does not have the power to determine which documents a party might submit are authentic or not. In that respect, therefore, Plaintiff's motion is **DENIED**.

To the extent, however, that Plaintiff's motion can be interpreted as a request to substitute a more legible document (Doc. # 30 at 4) in place of Doc # 5 at 183, Plaintiff's Motion is **GRANTED**. However, Plaintiff has also attached another document, labeled as "EXHIBI-2 (sic), appearing at p. 5 of Doc. 30. The court cannot ascertain what document this exhibit is intended to replace or whether it is a new document. Regardless, the court is not going to "authenticate" this document.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

LANCE S. WILSON, CLERK

By: /s/  
Deputy Clerk